It is inevitable that the Cabinet should be pulled in two directions—by the employers, who will hold them back from fulfilling their promises because of the threat to their profits, and the workers, who demand redress. The memorandum of the Bombay Government promised no reduction of wages without adequate enquiry, but labour leaders maintain that this is not the issue, but restoration of cuts and increased wages in a boom period. The "living wage" of the Election Manifesto is replaced by the "minimum wage" in the memorandum, and the joint conference merely uses the phrase "wage-fixing machinery." A minimum wage must be worked out in relation to the average budget of a working-class family. The owners, under cover of what "the industry can bear/[5] "competition," and "'differing costs of production," press for different minimum wages in different centres and for different categories of work.

Labour leaders accuse them of demanding legalisation of low wages and peace in industry at any price. They are afraid of lightning strikes and desire the wheels of industry to run smoothly in a time of boom. "Machinery for the settlement of disputes" is sometimes construed as a form of compulsory arbitration under the Law, in the sense that the employers before a lock-out and the workers before a strike will have to submit their demands to arbitration before taking action, though the award may not be compulsorily binding on either. The workers are assured that arbitration will not affect their right to strike. But the vital question is: Should lightning strikes be banned? It is urged that in India trade unions are more in the nature of Committees which'can not successfully intervene in a dispute as do the mighty unions in the democratic countries. lightning strikes are an effective means of securing rights before the owners have had an opportunity of demoralising the workers by victimising the militants* The owners, on their side, insist that such